

AARON N. COLBY (State Bar No. 247339)
aaron@colbylegal.com
ZOE YUZNA (State Bar No. 268496)
zoe@colbylegal.com
COLBY LAW FIRM, PC
13263 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 203
Studio City, California 91604
Telephone: (818) 253-1599
Fax: (818) 475-1981

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
11/01/2023 7:18 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By Y. Tarasyuk, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff
INGRID RODRIGUEZ

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

INGRID RODRIGUEZ, an individual and as a
representative of aggrieved employees pursuant to
the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA),

Plaintiff,

vs.

PATH, a non-profit corporation; and DOES 1
through 10 inclusive,

Defendant.

Case No. 23STCV26935

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR:

**1. PRIVATE ATTORNEY'S GENERAL
ACT (LABOR CODE SECTION 2698)**

Plaintiff Ingrid Rodriguez ("Plaintiff") alleges and complains against Defendants PATH and Does
1 through 10 (collectively, "Defendant") as follows:

PARTIES | JURISDICTION | VENUE

1. Plaintiff, at all times relevant hereto, is and has been a resident of the State of California.

2. Defendant PATH (People Assisting The Homeless) is a non-profit organization that helps
"people find permanent housing and provide case management, medical and mental healthcare, benefits
advocacy, employment training, and other services to help them maintain their homes stably." Defendant
PATH is headquartered at 340 N. Madison Avenue, Los Angeles, California.

3. Defendant conducts business in the State of California.

1 4. Under California Code of Civil Procedure section 395(a), venue is proper in this County
2 because Defendant resides in this County and/or Plaintiff's alleged injuries herein occurred in this County.

3 5. The true names and capacities of the defendants named herein as Does 1 through 10,
4 inclusive, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, are unknown to Plaintiff who therefore
5 sues such defendants by fictitious names pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 474.
6 Plaintiff believes that all of the Doe defendants are California residents. Plaintiff will amend this
7 Complaint to show such true names and capacities when they have been determined. Defendant and Doe
8 Defendants are collectively referred to as "Defendant," "Defendants" or "Defendant Employers."

9 6. Plaintiff believes that, at all times relevant herein, each defendant designated, including
10 Does 1 through 10, was the agent, managing agent, principal, owner, partner, joint venturer, representative,
11 manager, servant, employee, and/or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, and was at all times
12 mentioned herein acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment, and that all acts or
13 omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission,
14 encouragement, authorization, and consent of each defendant designated herein.

15 7. Defendant, and each of them, acted in concert with one another to commit the wrongful
16 acts alleged herein, and aided, abetted, incited, compelled and/or coerced one another in the wrongful acts
17 alleged herein, and/or attempted to do so, including pursuant to Government Code section 12940(i).
18 Defendant, and each of them, formed and executed a conspiracy or common plan pursuant to which they
19 would commit the unlawful acts alleged herein, with all such acts alleged herein done as part of and
20 pursuant to said conspiracy, intended to cause and actually causing Plaintiff harm.

21 **ALTER EGO | AGENCY | JOINT EMPLOYER**

22 8. There exists such a unity of interest and ownership between Defendant Employers that the
23 individuality and separateness of Defendant Employers have ceased to exist. At all times relevant hereto,
24 Defendant Employers, and each of them, were the agents, employees, managing agents, supervisors,
25 coconspirators, parent corporation, joint employers, alter egos, successors, and/or joint ventures of the
26 other Defendant Employers, and each of them, and in doing the things alleged herein, were acting at least
27 in part within the course and scope of said agency, employment, conspiracy, joint employer, alter ego
28 status, successor status and/or joint venture and with the permission and consent of each of the other

1 Defendant Employers. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this complaint to any act or failure
2 to act by a defendant or co-defendant, such allegations and references shall also be deemed to mean
3 the acts and/or failures to act by each defendant acting individually, jointly and severally.

4 9. Plaintiff believes Defendant Employers were both Plaintiff's joint employer and are liable
5 under the joint employer and single enterprise theories. *See Laird v. Capital Cities* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th
6 727, 737-38 (four factors to prove single enterprise are "interrelation of operations, common management,
7 centralized control of labor relations, and common ownership or financial control. ... Although courts
8 consider the four factors together, they often deem centralized control of labor relations the most
9 important."); *see also Vernon v. State of California* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 114, 128 (separate entities
10 can also be deemed a "joint employer" by having the right to control the employment relationship, as
11 evaluated by focusing on "an examination of defendant's role with respect to the right to hire, fire, transfer,
12 promote, discipline, set the terms, conditions and privileges of employment, train and pay the plaintiff.")).

13 10. Defendant Employers were Plaintiff's employers, joint employers and/or special
14 employers within the meaning of Government Code sections 12926 (d), 12940 (a),(h),(1), (h)(3)(A), (i),
15 and, 12950, and regularly employ five (5) or more persons and are therefore subject to the jurisdiction of
16 this Court. Defendant Employers were Plaintiff's employers, joint employers and/or special employers
17 within the meaning of the Labor Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Order, and are
18 each an "employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer" as such term is used in Labor Code
19 sections 558 and/or 558.1, and liable to Plaintiff on that basis. Defendant Employers are Plaintiff's joint
20 employers by virtue of a joint enterprise, and that Plaintiff was an employee of Defendant Employers.
21 Plaintiff performed services for each and every one of Defendant Employers, and to the mutual benefit
22 of all Defendant Employers, and all Defendant Employers shared control of Plaintiff as an employee,
23 either directly or indirectly, and the manner in which Defendant Employers' business was and is
24 conducted.

25 11. Labor Code section 558.1 provides that an employer or "other person acting on behalf of
26 an employer" who violates certain California wage and hour laws "may be held liable as the employer for
27 such violation." Labor Code section 558.1 defines "other person acting on behalf of an employer" as a
28 "natural person who is an owner, director, officer, or managing agent" of the employer. Labor Code

section 558.1(b). *See* Labor Code section 558(a) (authorizing civil penalties against “any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer” who causes overtime pay violations to occur.”); *see Atempa v. Pedrazzani*, 27 Cal.App.5th 809, 823-824 (2018); Labor Code section 1197.1 (“Any employer or other person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person” for failure to pay minimum wages.”); *see Reynolds v. Bement*, 36 Cal.4th 1075, 1089 (2005) (“aggrieved employees may ... maintain civil actions to recover such penalties”); *see Reynolds v. Bement*, 36 Cal.4th 1075, 1089, fn. 10 (2005) (alter ego doctrine may be used in wage claim actions to impose liability on controlling directors and shareholders); *see* Government Code section 12925(d) (defining “Person” as one *or more* individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, limited liability companies, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, and receivers or other fiduciaries).

12. Despite the formation of purported corporate existence, Defendant Employers are, in reality, one and the same, including, but not limited to because: (a) Defendant Employers are completely dominated and controlled by one another, who personally committed the frauds and violated the laws as set forth in this complaint, and who have hidden and currently hide behind Defendant Employers to perpetrate frauds, circumvent statutes, or accomplish some other wrongful or inequitable purpose; (b) Defendant Employers derive actual and significant monetary benefits by and through one another’s unlawful conduct, and by using one another as the funding source for their own personal expenditures; (c) Defendant Employers, while really one and the same, were segregated to appear as though separate and distinct for purposes of perpetrating a fraud, circumventing a statute, or accomplishing some other wrongful or inequitable purpose; (d) Defendant Employers does not comply with all requisite corporate formalities to maintain a legal and separate corporate existence; (e) the business affairs of Defendant Employers are, and at all times relevant were, so mixed and intermingled that the same cannot reasonably be segregated, and the same are in inextricable confusion. Defendant Employers are, and at all times relevant hereto were, used by one another as a mere shell and conduit for the conduct of certain of Defendant Employers’ affairs, and are, and were, the alter ego of one another. The recognition of the separate existence of each of the Defendant Employers would not promote justice, in that it would permit Defendant Employers to insulate themselves from liability to Plaintiff for violations of the law.

13. The corporate existence of Defendant Employers should each be disregarded in equity and

1 for the ends of justice because such disregard is necessary to avoid fraud and injustice to Plaintiff herein.
2 Accordingly, Defendant Employers constitute the alter ego of one another, and the fiction of their separate
3 corporate existence must be disregarded.

4 **ADMINISTRATIVE EXHAUSTION**

5 14. Plaintiff exhausted administrative requirements for Plaintiff's claims.

6 15. On August 22, 2023, Plaintiff's counsel gave written notice by online filing with the
7 California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and by sending via certified mail to
8 Defendants a letter specifying the California Labor Code provisions Defendants violated, including the
9 facts and theories supporting the alleged violations. More than sixty-five (65) days have passed since
10 Plaintiff's counsel submitted the letter to the LWDA and certified-mailed the letter to Defendants, and the
11 LWDA has not provided notice of intent to investigate the alleged violations, nor have Defendants
12 provided notice of intent or any efforts to cure. Accordingly, the statutory period for any investigation or
13 response has concluded and Plaintiff may commence this lawsuit pursuant to Labor Code section 2699,
14 as provided by subsection 2699.3.

15 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

16 16. **Defendant.** Defendant PATH (People Assisting The Homeless) is a non-profit
17 organization that helps "people find permanent housing and provide case management, medical and
18 mental healthcare, benefits advocacy, employment training, and other services to help them maintain their
19 homes stably." Defendant PATH is headquartered at 340 N. Madison Avenue, Los Angeles, California.

20 17. **Plaintiff's Hire.** On or about March 27, 2023, Medix Staffing Solutions hired Plaintiff
21 Ingrid Rodriguez (born in 1969) as an employee in the job position of Case Manager to work on
22 assignment at Defendant PATH. Plaintiff was an exemplary employee, until her wrongful termination on
23 July 18, 2023.

24 18. **Plaintiff's Job Details.** Plaintiff's job duties included housing navigation, time limited
25 subsidies, and vouchers for housing. Plaintiff's job duties included in-field work traveling from housing
26 site to housing site, and meeting with clients at various locations.

27 19. Plaintiff's work schedule was typically Monday through Friday, 8:00am to 4:30pm, plus
28 reviewing and responding to after-hours messages.

20. Defendant classified Plaintiff as a “non-exempt” employee, paid \$24 per hour. Exhibit 1.

21. **Wrongful Termination (Discrimination & Retaliation).** On July 18, 2023, Defendant PATH fired Plaintiff based on age discrimination and in retaliation for complaints Plaintiff made about harassment and discrimination.

22. **Off-The-Clock Work.** Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff for all time worked. The off-the-clock work included, among other things according to proof: working during breaks, such as carrying on with work during a meal or rest break; reviewing or responding to emails or texts from a mobile device or after hours; and/or traveling during work or on work-related errands to and from work.

23. **Overtime Work.** Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff for work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek at the rate of time-and-one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and for work in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times the regular rate of pay.

24. **Meal Break Violations.** Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff with first or second timely, uninterrupted 30-minute meal break as required by law, according to proof. For instance, among other things according to proof: Plaintiff did not get meal breaks at all; Plaintiff was forced to work throughout Plaintiff’s meal breaks; Defendant automatically deducted unpaid meal break time from Plaintiff’s time worked even though Plaintiff performed work during such time; Defendant rounded Plaintiff’s clock in and out times for the start and end of meal breaks; Plaintiff’s meal breaks were not timely; Plaintiff’s meal breaks were interrupted; Plaintiff’s meal breaks were less than the full 30 minutes; and/or Defendant required Plaintiff to remain on premises at the worksite during meal breaks.

25. Defendant’s company-wide understaffing arising from labor budget policies and subsequent failure to provide adequate break coverage prevented Plaintiff from taking compliant meal breaks. As a result of these practices and/or policies, Plaintiff was “on-call” and required to continue to perform duties without being able to take a timely, compliant meal break. Thus, Plaintiff had to work through part or all of Plaintiff’s meal breaks, had meal breaks interrupted, and/or wait extended breaks of time before taking meal breaks.

26. Defendant required Plaintiff to always record meal breaks, even when meal breaks were

never taken, or were late, short, and/or interrupted. As a result, 30-minute meal breaks were deducted from Plaintiff's time records for hours Plaintiff actually spent working. This is a form of off-the-clock work that Plaintiff performed.

27. Defendant has engaged in a company-wide practice and/or policy to not pay meal break premiums owed when compliant meal breaks are not provided. ***Defendant never paid Plaintiff a meal break premium.*** Exhibit 2. Defendant, therefore, failed to provide Plaintiff compliant meal breaks and failed to pay the full meal break premiums due.

28. **Rest Break Violations.** Defendant failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take a 10-minute rest break per each four (4) hour period worked or a major fraction thereof, according to proof. For instance, among other things according to proof: Plaintiff did not get rest breaks at all; Plaintiff was forced to work throughout Plaintiff's rest breaks; Plaintiff was "on-call" during rest breaks; Plaintiff's rest breaks were not timely; Plaintiff's rest breaks were interrupted; Plaintiff's rest breaks were less than the full 10 minutes; and/or Defendant required Plaintiff to remain on premises at the worksite during rest breaks.

29. Defendant's labor budget policies and resultant understaffing prevented Plaintiff from being relieved of all duties to take compliant rest breaks. Defendant had no policy of scheduling rest breaks for employees, which further impeded and prevented Plaintiff from taking rest breaks. As a result of Defendant's understaffing and failure to schedule rest breaks, Plaintiff worked shifts in excess of 3.5 hours, in excess of six (6) hours, and in excess of 10 hours without receiving all uninterrupted 10-minute rest breaks to which Plaintiff was entitled.

30. Defendant has engaged in a company-wide practice and/or policy to not pay rest break premiums owed when compliant rest breaks are not provided. ***Defendant never paid Plaintiff a rest break premium.*** Exhibit 2. Defendant, therefore, failed to provide Plaintiff compliant rest breaks and failed to pay the full rest break premiums due.

31. **Unreimbursed Expenses.** Defendant failed to fully reimburse Plaintiff's reasonable business expenses incurred, according to proof, including: mobile device usage costs and travel costs. ***Defendant did not provide Plaintiff any reimbursement of expenses.*** Exhibit 2.

32. **Wage Statements.** Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff with

uniform, complete, and accurate wage statements because the wage statements provided to Plaintiff failed to list the: accurate totals of the hours worked; number of hours worked at each hourly rate; net wages earned; and/or gross wages earned.

33. **Final Pay.** Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff all wages owed to Plaintiff immediately upon Plaintiff's termination of employment, including earned and unpaid wages, such as: minimum wages; overtime wages; and/or meal and rest period premium wages.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

**PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION FOR PENALTIES PURSUANT TO
LABOR CODE SECTION 2698**

34. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding and subsequent paragraphs.

35. Under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), Labor Code sections 2698-2699.5, private parties may recover civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code. These penalties are in addition to any other relief available under the Labor Code. As set forth above, Defendant has committed numerous violations of the Labor Code against Plaintiff, including but not limited to:

- **Labor Code §§ 201, 201.5, 202, 203.** Failure to pay all wages immediately upon termination or within 72 hours after notice of separation.
- **Labor Code § 204.** Failure to pay all earned wages within the time prescribed in Labor Code §§ 204(a) and 204(b).
- **Labor Code § 206.** Failure to pay all undisputedly owed wages.
- **Labor Code § 210.** Failure to pay wages as required by Labor Code §§ 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5, 227.3, and/or 1197.5.
- **Labor Code § 212.** Failure to include the name and address of established place of business in the state on pay checks to cash or deposit pay checks.
- **Labor Code § 213.** Unauthorized payment of final wages via direct deposit.
- **Labor Code § 221.** Failure to not collect and receive owed wages.

///

///

- 1 • **Labor Code § 226.** Failure to provide timely and accurate wage statements.¹
- 2 • **Labor Code § 226.3.** Failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a).
- 3 • **Labor Code § 226.7.** Failure to provide rest periods and failure to provide an additional hour of
- 4 pay at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the rest periods.
- 5 • **Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.** Failure to provide meal periods and failure to provide an
- 6 additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the meal periods.
- 7 • **Labor Code § 256.** Failure to pay all wages immediately upon termination or within 72 hours
- 8 after notice of separation.
- 9 • **Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194.** Failure to pay overtime and double time compensation.
- 10 • **Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197.** Failure to pay minimum wages, including overtime
- 11 and double time compensation at the minimum wage rate.
- 12 • **Labor Code § 558.** Violation of a section of the chapter of the Labor Code starting with Labor
- 13 Code § 500, *et seq.*, or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the
- 14 Industrial Welfare Commission.
- 15 • **Labor Code § 558.1.** Violation any provision regulating minimum wages or hours and days of
- 16 work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, and violating Labor Code §§ 203, 226,
- 17 226.7, 1193.1, and/or 1194.
- 18 • **Labor Code § 1174.** Failure to maintain compliant employee and payroll records.
- 19 • **Labor Code § 1197.1.** Failure to pay minimum wage.
- 20 • **Labor Code § 1199.** Violation of an order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.
- 21 • **Labor Code § 1198.** Violation of the following sections of orders of the Industrial Welfare
- 22 Commission for conditions of labor prohibited by such:
 - 23 a. **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 3,** requiring an
 - 24 employer to pay overtime and double time compensation.

25 ///

26 ///

28 ¹ *Bernstein v. Virgin America, Inc.*, 3 F.4th 1127 (9th Cir. 2021) (awarding nearly \$4.4 million in statutory Labor Code § 226 penalties and an additional \$5 million in PAGA civil penalties for Labor Code § 226 violations).

- b. **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 4**, requiring an employer to pay minimum wages, including overtime and double time compensation at the minimum wage rate.
- c. **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 7**, requiring an employer to maintain accurate information with respect to each employee; provide employees with thorough and accurate itemized wage statements; and, provide clocks within a reasonable distance from employees' work areas.
- d. **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 11**, requiring an employer to provide its employees with adequate meal periods and an additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the rest periods.
- e. **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 12**, requiring an employer to provide its employees with adequate rest periods and an additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the rest periods.
- **Labor Code § 2802**. Failure to reimburse necessary business expenses.

36. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of California Labor Code section 2699(c), and a proper representative to bring a civil action on behalf of Plaintiff and other current and former employees of Defendant pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor Code section 2699.3, because Plaintiff is employed by Defendant and the alleged violations of the California Labor Code were committed against Plaintiff.

37. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff gave written notice on August 22, 2023 by online filing to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendant of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. More than 65 days have passed since Plaintiff provided written notice to the LWDA. The LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate PLAINTIFF’S claims.

///

///

///

1 e. For such other and further relief as deemed just and proper.
2

3 DATED: November 1, 2023

COLBY LAW FIRM, PC

4
5 

6 By: _____

7 AARON N. COLBY

8 ZOE YUZNA

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

10 INGRID RODRIGUEZ
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1



3/12/2023

Ingrid Rodriguez
REDACTED

Dear Ingrid

Medix presents to you the terms of employment with Medix on assignment with our client, PATH (People Assisting The Homeless) Los Angeles, as (a/an) Prevention / Home Safe Case Manager. We are confident that your qualifications and abilities will contribute positively to our client. The key components of this assignment are as follows:

- This position is classified as a contract role, as an employee of Medix, on assignment at the workplace for our client.
- You will be paid weekly on Friday for the hours that you work at a rate of \$24.00 per hour. Overtime will be paid out in accordance with State and Federal laws at \$36.00 per hour.
- Unless otherwise approved by your Medix Recruiter, Taylor Apple in writing, you will not be reimbursed for meal or lodging expenses.
- Your start date is scheduled to be 3/13/2023.

This letter is a contingent offer of employment, and is simply a description of the expected terms of the employment while on assignment with our client, PATH (People Assisting The Homeless) Los Angeles. Your employment is conditioned upon obtaining and passing all necessary pre-employment requirements within the allotted time given to you. Your employment will be at-will, subject to termination at any time, with or without notice, with or without cause, by either you, the client facility, or Medix.

If you have any questions, please contact your Recruiter, Taylor Apple at taylor.apple@medixteam.com. We look forward to the commencement of your assignment with our client, PATH (People Assisting The Homeless) Los Angeles.

Thank you,
Medix

EXHIBIT 2

CO	F LE	DEP	CLOCK	VCHR NO	060
Z2M	945934	107		0000131064	1

Earnings Statement



MEDIX STAFFING SOLUTIONS INC
222 S. RIVERSIDE PLAZA
SUITE 2120
CHICAGO, IL 60606

Period Beginning: 03/19/2023
Period Ending: 03/25/2023
Pay Date: 03/31/2023

Filing Status: Single/Married filing separately
Exemptions/Allowances:
Federal: Standard Withholding Table

INGRID RODRIGUEZ
REDACTED

Social Security Number: REDACTED

Earnings	rate	hours	this period	year to date
Regular	15.0000	2.00	30.00	798.00
Regular	24.0000	32.00	768.00	
Gross Pay			\$798.00	798.00

Other Benefits and Information	this period	total to date
Totl Hrs Worked	34.00	

Important Notes

YOUR COMPANY'S PHONE NUMBER S 312 487 5800

BAS S OF PAY: HOURLY

Additional Tax Withholding Information

Taxable Marital Status:
CA: Single
Exemptions/Allowances:
CA: 0

Deductions	Statutory	
Federal Income Tax	-59.56	59.56
Social Security Tax	-49.48	49.48
Medicare Tax	-11.57	11.57
CA State Income Tax	-18.44	18.44
CA SDI Tax	-7.18	7.18
Net Pay	\$651.77	
Checking #1	-651.77	
Net Check	\$0.00	

Your federal taxable wages this period are \$798.00

© 2000 ADP Inc.

MEDIX STAFFING SOLUTIONS INC
222 S. RIVERSIDE PLAZA
SUITE 2120
CHICAGO, IL 60606

Advice number: 00000131064
Pay date: 03/31/2023

Deposited to the account of	account number	transit ABA	amount
INGRID RODRIGUEZ	xxxxxxx1283	xxxx xxxx	\$651.77

THIS IS NOT A CHECK

NON-NEGOTIABLE

CO.	FILE	DEPT.	CLOCK	VCHR. NO.	060
Z2M	945934	107		0000241043	1

MEDIX STAFFING SOLUTIONS INC
 222 S. RIVERSIDE PLAZA
 SUITE 2120
 CHICAGO, IL 60606

Filing Status: Single/Married filing separately
 Exemptions/Allowances:
 Federal: Standard Withholding Table

Social Security Number: REDACTED

Earnings	rate	hours	this period	year to date
Regular	24.0000	34.32	823.68	10,334.88
Overtime				91.80
Gross Pay			\$823.68	10,426.68

Deductions	Statutory		
	Federal Income Tax	-62.65	816.82
	Social Security Tax	-51.06	646.45
	Medicare Tax	-11.95	151.19
	CA State Income Tax	-19.57	277.23
	CA SDI Tax	-7.41	93.84
Net Pay		\$671.04	
Checking #1		-671.04	
Net Check		\$0.00	

Your federal taxable wages this period are \$823.68

Earnings Statement



Period Beginning: 06/04/2023
 Period Ending: 06/10/2023
 Pay Date: 06/16/2023

INGRID RODRIGUEZ

REDACTED

Other Benefits and Information	this period	total to date
Total Hrs Worked	34.32	

Important Notes

YOUR COMPANY'S PHONE NUMBER IS 312-487-5800

BASIS OF PAY: HOURLY

Additional Tax Withholding Information

Taxable Marital Status:
 CA: Single
 Exemptions/Allowances:
 CA: 0

CO FILE DEPT. CLOCK VCHR. NO. 060
 Z2M 945934 107 0000251036 1

MEDIX STAFFING SOLUTIONS INC
 222 S. RIVERSIDE PLAZA
 SUITE 2120
 CHICAGO, IL 60606

Filing Status: Single/Married filing separately
 Exemptions/Allowances:
 Federal: Standard Withholding Table

Social Security Number: REDACTED

Earnings	rate	hours	this period	year to date
Regular	24.0000	37.95	910.80	11,245.68
Overtime				91.80
Gross Pay			\$910.80	11,337.48

Deductions	Statutory		year to date
Federal Income Tax	-73.10		889.92
Social Security Tax	-56.47		702.92
Medicare Tax	-13.20		164.39
CA State Income Tax	-25.26		302.49
CA SDI Tax	-8.20		102.04
Net Pay	\$734.57		
Checking #1	-734.57		
Net Check	\$0.00		

Your federal taxable wages this period are \$910.80

Earnings Statement



Period Beginning: 06/11/2023
 Period Ending: 06/17/2023
 Pay Date: 06/23/2023

INGRID RODRIGUEZ

REDACTED

Other Benefits and Information	this period	total to date
Totl Hrs Worked	37.95	

Important Notes

YOUR COMPANY'S PHONE NUMBER IS 312-487-5800

BASIS OF PAY: HOURLY

Additional Tax Withholding Information

Taxable Marital Status:
 CA: Single
 Exemptions/Allowances:
 CA: 0